

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-7 and 46-63 will be pending in this application. Claims 10-13, 33, 36-38 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13, 16, 33, 36-38 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 16, 17, 33 and 36-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 ("Chen"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Interview Summary

Applicants' undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Greta Robinson participated in a telephonic interview on August 8, 2006 to discuss claim amendments similar to the present claim amendments. Examiner Robinson noted that the Chen reference discloses a plurality of parse trees, and, therefore, that the present claim amendments requiring a single common parse appear to distinguish the claims from the Chen reference.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 10-13, 33, 36-38 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse and note that claims 10-13, 33, 36-38 and 42-44 are hereby cancelled. Applicants further note that independent claims 1, 7, 47, 52, 57 and 59 provide several useful results such as, for example, but not limited to, displaying search results.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 13, 16, 33, 36-38 and 42-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse and note that independent claim 1 is hereby amended to recite a preamble proposed by the Examiner in the Office Action in connection with this rejection. Applicants further note that claims 2 and

4-6 are dependent upon claim 1. Applicants respectfully traverse and note that claims 13, 16, 33, 36-38 and 42-44 are hereby cancelled.

2. Claims 10-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being incomplete for omitting essential elements. Applicants note that claims 10-12 are hereby cancelled.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 16, 17, 33 and 36-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,507,856 ("Chen"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1 and 7 recite parsing a query to define a single common parse tree that is transformable by a plurality of different search providers. By contrast, Chen discloses that a different parse tree is generated based on each separate invoice request from each individual browser (Chen, Col. 4, ll. 12-20). Thus, Chen does not teach or suggest the single common parse tree recited in independent claims 1 and 7.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by Chen. Applicants further submit that claims 2 and 4-6 are patentable at least by reason of their dependency. Applicants note that claims 7-13, 16, 17, 33 and 36-44 are hereby cancelled. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejections are respectfully requested.

New Claims 46-63

1. Applicants note that new independent claim 47 relates to the subject matter of claim 1 in a different claim format. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that claim 47 and claims 48-51 that depend therefrom are patentable for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1.

2. New independent claims 52, 57 and 59 recite “a user interface comprising a single common set of query input fields generated based on different query language features supported by each of a plurality of search providers.” The Office Action (Pg. 5, ¶9) analogizes the return XML message (Fig. 7, element 145) of Chen to the claimed “user interface.” However, Chen discloses that a different return XML message is generated based on each separate invoice request from each separate browser (Chen, Col. 3, l. 65 – Col. 4, l. 15). Thus, Chen does not teach or suggest the “user interface comprising single common set of query input fields generated based on different query language features supported by each of a plurality of search providers” recited in independent claims 52, 57 and 59.


DOCKET NO.: 144166.1 / MSFT-0561
Application No.: 09/717,588
Office Action Dated: July 3, 2006

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants further submit that no new matter has been added by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: October 10, 2006


Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439